

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the Office Action of October 31, 2007.

Reconsideration and allowance of the application and all presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1, 5-13, 17, 19-21, 25, 29-43, and 45-48 are pending in this application. Claims 12 and 43 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 14-16, 18, 22-24, and 26-28 are canceled. The prior art made of record has been considered, but is not believed to affect the patentability of the presently pending claims. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by the amendments and that a new search is not necessary.

Applicants appreciate the Office noting that claims 1, 5-11, 21, 29-42, and 48 are in condition for allowance.

CLAIMS

Claim 12

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious or anticipated by Cousin et. al. (U.S. Patent 4,554,181) and Nigram (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0087112, as discussed in the Office Action. Applicants traverse each of the 103 rejections in the Office Action. However, to expedite allowance of the this matter, Applicants have amended claim 12 to incorporate the features of claim 26, which the Office Action indicated would be allowable if these features were incorporated into claim 12. Therefore, the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 17, 19-21, and 25

Applicants traverse all of the §102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 13, 17, 19-21, and 25 include every feature of independent claim 12 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 12. Thus, pending dependent claims 13, 17, 19-21, and 25 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In re Fine, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Claim 43

Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as purportedly being obvious or anticipated by Cousin et. al. (U.S. Patent 4,554,181) and Nigram (U.S. Patent Application 2003/0087112, as discussed in the Office Action. Applicants traverse each of the 103 rejections in the Office Action. The references do not teach a cationic guanidine polymer compound (structural formula I) or salt thereof in combination with a metallic salt, as recited in the claim 43. Therefore, the rejection of claim 43 should be withdrawn.

Claims 45-47

Applicants traverse all of the §102 and 103 rejections in the Office Action. Applicants respectfully submit that pending dependent claims 45-47 include every feature of independent claim 43 and that the cited references fail to teach, disclose, or suggest at least the features of claim 43. Thus, pending dependent claims 45-47 are also allowable over the prior art of record. In re Fine.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

In addition, any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known since the Office Action does not include specific factual findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'CBL', is written over a horizontal line.

Christopher B. Linder, Reg. No. 47,751